From: aaron smith <adsbusinessinfo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 2:37 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I am against the 10:1 Leverage change.

Aaron, forex trader

From: tom <tomsebox777@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 3:14 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Retail forex and the 10:1 leverage proposal by the CFTC--Public comment

---

CFTC Secretary-David Stawick,

Why is the CFTC insistent upon ruining the retail forex industry. You have already reduced leverage down to 100:1, eliminated the ticket based system in favor of FIFO, eliminated hedging and now are proposing the new 10:1 leverage mandates. What is going on in the heads of those at the CFTC?? I get the impression that you blame retail forex for the recent financial/market turmoils over the last few years. For the record, it was the big banks, the crooked mortgage industry, the crooks on Wall Street and elsewhere, the ratings agencies and elimination of Glass-Steagall which started the financial mess, not retail forex. Trading is hard enough on it's own, the question I propose to the CFTC is "why are you trying to make it more difficult by taking away all of the positives that retail forex used to have?" You are also making it very difficult for the little guy to participate in trading by raising the cost of entry into the forex market. Is that what you want? To reduce business in this area and bar the little guy from participating?? That is what it sounds like. It sounds discriminatory because these proposals won't affect the rich or the well financed banks who received all their bailout money. They have more than enough resources to stay in the game. The little guy does not. You and the CFTC are doing a great job if your agenda is to eliminate the little guy from retail forex. By propsing to raise the cost of entry to margin a position you are in effect raising the cost of entry into retail forex while at the same time increasing the odds that a trader will suffer a margin call due to higher margin requirements eating up more of a traders account equity even when a trader chooses not to increase his position size. Retail forex already had a nice system in place where if one's account equity dropped below their margin requirements to carry a position then all psoitions would automatically be closed. In fact it was actually a safer system then the current futures industry has because there one can still owe more money when a margin call is triggered due to gaps and fast markets which are known to happen much more in futures than forex. The depth and liquidity in retail forex usually prevented huge gaps or surprise slippage.
The bottom line is this: retail forex has good risk systems in place as of now, and by tinkering with lowering leverage or raising cost of entry you will just increase the probabilities of more traders getting margin calls because the cost of entry will eat more of their account equity from the start.
And please don't ask the little traders of the world to just add more money to their accounts because we don't have the luxury of a government printing press, and we don't receive taxpayer money to bail us out either. We are the last of the true capitalist because when we win we win but when we lose we lose on our own without asking for government money. Please don't destroy what is left of retail forex by reducing leverage from 100:1 down to 10:1 because it is not necessary and it is discrimatory concerning the well financed traders of the world vs. the little guy trying to make it. My point: the new leverage proposals won't affect the big players as much as the little players of retail forex. I could go deeper on this subject, but hopefully you get the point on this note.

Not in favor of 10:1 retail forex leverage. Please leave it at 100:1 or better yet bring it back to 400:1. Like I said before, retail forex already has a good risk margin call system in place......it's real simple.......if account equity falls below margin requirements then all positions are closed by the system. So I ask, what's the problem? Why is this even an issue??

Individuals should be able to manage their accounts as they see fit without interference from regulators. After all, this is the United States, and capitalism should be allowed to operate as free as possible for ALL those that operate honestly and for ALL those that are willing to accept the risks knowing that they will not look to government for bailout money when things go south.

And please remember, those of us that trade understand the risks, if we win...great!! If we lose, oh well, that is the downside of risk taking. But whether we win or lose that should be left for the individual to deal with, without excessive interference from regulators. When it comes to managing our own accounts-- we, the individual, should be able to manage it within a framework that gives us **choice, flexibility and the proper trading tools**. When retail forex had 400 to 1 leverage, ticket based trading, hedging etc. it gave the individual many ways to manage our trades and accounts. Now you have taken all that away and in the process the CFTC is destroying the retail forex industry.
I liked how the CFTC developed the futures and commodities exchanges over the years because you provided centralized exchanges for trading the contracts and ample leverage for those that were willing to take on the risk of trading. But I feel that you have crossed the line and are actually hurting retail forex with your new rules and proposals. Afterall, retail forex is an OTC market and trades 24 hours a day, it is different in structure than futures and commodities and requires choice and flexibility for the trader to have any chance at navigating these markets.
So I say, bring back leverage up to 400:1, as well as the hedging and ticket based trading and let individuals manage their own accounts as they see fit. There is no need to reduce leverage more by making it 10:1. One really has to wonder who suggested 10:1 leverage, quite honestly, it sounds like a decision made out of fear. Remember, retail forex did not cause the financial troubles of the last few years. There was never a problem in retail forex.

Please don't ruin the retail forex market any further, in fact I would like to ask that you bring it back to what it was back in May of 2009 by allowing us choice, flexibility and the proper trading tools needed to have a chance at trading forex successfully.

Thank you for your attention to my email. And again, not in favor of 10:1 leverage.

Public comment.

From: kp72@vcsn.com
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 4:46 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

In regards to discussions concerning retail forex investing practices (id RIN 3038-AC61)

To whom this may concern:

I'm honestly not sure how to begin this so I'm going to jump right in...

PLEASE STOP !!

I've been an active investor since 1997 and I stared trading in forex markets in 2006. I was very excited to venture into this market because previously it had been closed to the "average joe" (i.e. retail) investor. Technological advances as well as an evolution in financial markets had finally allowed ANY investor opportunities to utilize highly leveraged financial vehicles (HLFVs)...

..then the worse financial crisis in america and perhaps in world history "hit"

and now YOU, the regulator are OVER REACTING.

Retail investors did not cause this financial crisis- certainly NOT retail forex investors. HLFVs can be an essential strategy for investors who have the knowledge and risk appetite for them. YOUR JOB is to insure free markets remain free, open and available to everyone. If you want know how you can help ASK.

Amazingly the biggest issue in forex is the one thing I have not heard you doing anything about- the dealing desk. If you want to help, how about you force forex brokers to use a true ECN/STP model. I won't include the reasons why but you can contact me, google around or ask any retail forex investor why.

I've been investing a long time, I'm also a programmer and an engineer so I don't live in a fantasy world. I don't have any illusions about the dynamics of investing and that it means making AND losing money. What irks means about what you regulators are doing, is that you assume I need your help. I do not- and I suspect that most do not. We are the consumers of products & services- financial products & services but consumers still. You do remember us, right? WE are what makes the market run and we are also what makes the market evolve. Again your job is to make sure WE can do that. Your actions will roll us back to a time where only rich people and big business can effectively use HLFVs.

To say it again- PLEASE STOP

and to go further-

1) remove the current 100:1 (1%) restriction

2) develop a framework and timetable to sunset dealing desk infrastructures

I hope this message finds an open ear

--
Keith C. Perry, MS E.E.
an American, an Investor
215.432.5167

From: Joseph Paul Vadara <dlovingjoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 7:19 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Cc: cs@alpari-us.com
Subject: My idea about leverage reduction.

with much pleasure, i want to express my view regarding the decision that CFTC is trying to take concerning the limiting the leverage of 1:100 to 1:10.actually i want to say that it will not be good for the leverage to be limited to 1:10 instead of the existing one of 1:100.just as alpari has discover,it will not be encouraging for beginners. though it is well known that the higher the profit also the higher the lost, yet i think living it as it is now is better, since even as it is now is still allow for a client to trade at 1:10 so it is likely the same. but it will be very good and encouraging if the leverage will maintain its position of 1:100 instead of limiting it to 1:10 only. Thank you.

Joseph paul vadara.

From: Petro Katsafaros <pkatsafaros@ameritech.net>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 10:11 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of retail forex

ID # RIN 3038-AC61

Hello,

As a retail forex investor I oppose lowering the margin requirements to 10:1

This will not enable me to trade competively with others who have much larger bank accounts.
Currently forex enables me to supplement my income with the profits I make from trading.
Please do not take this away from us.

Thank you for listening

Peter Katsafaros

From: chad harper <xu4ch@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 10:30 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: 17 CFR parts1,3,4, et al

Dear Secretary Stawick,

I am an American Forex trader. I have been trading the Forex markets for several years. The foreign currency markets provide individuals with a real opportunity to achieve financial independence. The Forex industry in America employs thousands of accountants, advisors, administrators, and I.T. technicians. The revenue of the brokerages operating in the U.S. is spent in the U.S. on American goods and services. The brokerage firms in America are already diligently regulated with stringent requirements, providing American traders with safe and secure trading venues. In 2009 new regulations were imposed by the NFA which included FIFO and a sharp increase in margin requirements. These changes had no positive effects for traders or brokers. The trading platforms before FIFO were far more versatile, and the increase in margin requirements sent many thousands of traders' accounts overseas. In spite of the new regulations of 2009, trading the Forex markets in the U.S. is still worthwhile, but barely. If the margin requirements are any further increased, it simply will not be worth it to trade these markets in America. Traders will move to offshore brokerages, costing America billions in lost revenue. Please do not increase margin requirements or you will effectively destroy the Forex industry in America.

From: Johnny Raymond <jfray2009@live.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 10:59 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Sir:
As a trader, I request the above reference not be implemented. Traders are able to manage their own accounts as regulations now allow. The government should not become involved in dictating to individuals how to manage their own funds and accounts.

Johnny Raymond
208 15th Avenue
Canyon, TX 79015

From: no-reply@erulemaking.net
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 10:59 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Public Submission for 2010-00456
Attach: Public Submission for 2010-00456.zip

Please refer to the attached file.

Please Do Not Reply This Email.

Public Comments on Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries:========

Title: Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries
FR Document Number: 2010-00456
Legacy Document ID:
RIN: null
Publish Date: Wed Jan 20 00:00:00 EST 2010
Submitter Info:

first_name Scott
last_name Hassa
address1 679 William Bliss Drive
city New Milford
country United States
us_state NJ
zip 07646
company

Most if not all people who trade forex know the danger of leverage and how to properly use it.. Many including myself keep a certain percentage of cash in the forex brokerage account and a certain percentage in a cash equivalent account which we treat as a total sum when trading our account, using the leverage in a calculated and responsible manner. Limiting leverage to such a low 1:10 ratio will impact our ability to trade how we have been trading, and many traders including myself will transfer our accounts overseas and the US market will lose our business and tax revenue. I am all for regulation and oversight of the FX market, but this change is doing more harm than good.

From: no-reply@erulemaking.net
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 11:00 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Public Submission for 2010-00456
Attach: Public Submission for 2010-00456.zip

Please refer to the attached file.

Please Do Not Reply This Email.

Public Comments on Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries:========

Title: Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries
FR Document Number: 2010-00456
Legacy Document ID:
RIN: null
Publish Date: Wed Jan 20 00:00:00 EST 2010
Submitter Info:

first_name narasimha
last_name polkampally
address1 14905 79 ave
city flushing
country United States
us_state NY
zip 11457
company individual

1-10 will hury my job/income. please do not bring down the leverage

From: no-reply@erulemaking.net
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 11:00 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Public Submission for 2010-00456
Attach: Public Submission for 2010-00456.zip

Please refer to the attached file.

Please Do Not Reply This Email.

Public Comments on Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries:========

Title: Regulation of Off-Exchange Retail Foreign Exchange Transactions and Intermediaries
FR Document Number: 2010-00456
Legacy Document ID:
RIN: null
Publish Date: Wed Jan 20 00:00:00 EST 2010
Submitter Info:

first_name Dan
last_name Schrader
address1 208 Washington St.
city Canal Winchester
country United States
us_state OH
zip 43110
company

I realize that a "regulatory" agency exists to make regulations. But there comes a time where it becomes out of control, almost a situation where more regulations have to be made to either justify one's job, or to placate their political masters. When all is said and done we will become Europe, which seems to be the goal of the current administration. (except even Europe isn't contemplating these kind of restrictions) I know that us "little people" will not have a chance of stopping this action no matter the objections of a vast majority of traders. We understand that people like Mr. Soros do not like us playing in their sandbox, and like the FDIC and IndyMac/OneWest deal the crooks will be given what they want by Mr. Obama and his regulatory agencies.

From: David of Chattanooga <davidngerri@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 11:49 AM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear CFTC Secretary,

Regarding RIN 3038-AC61, which involves the current CFTC movement to reduce maximum forex market trading leverages from the current 100:1 level down to a 10:1 level.

Passage of this regulation will harm the ability of the smaller trader to be able to trade in this market. Many of these smaller traders are trading full time for their full income and by doing this you will in turn cause them to lose their job and source of income. Your regulation of said market in the USA will give all traders in other countries undue advantage and cause a burden to peoples in your own country. We do not need this and if you are trying to regulate banks and large investors it will not hurt them at all as they already trade in that fashion.
We as traders are fully aware of the risks of leverage.

What we are NOT happy about is unscrupulous brokers and market makers who can internally manipulate market prices within their in-house trading client communities due to the highly UNregulated pricing of forex pairs. This would be a much more worthwhile focus for your efforts...making sure that TRUE interbank pricing is available for ALL forex market participants.

By the way, your crackdown on the minimum capitalization requirements for FCM's was a GOOD thing. Those are the kind of constructive regulations that are welcome and beneficial to the markets and their participants.

Regards

David Wanamaker

From: Eric Botticelli <ericbotticelli@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 12:41 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex (Margin Change)

With increased risk can come increased gain. The reason we trade the forex is because it allows us to take increased risks and therefore allows increased gains. Please do not clamp down the forex market to middle class Americans.

Changing the 100:1 margin to 10:1 forces forex traders to come up with 10 times the capital to make the same gains they are accustomed to. This forces us to either accept smaller gains/losses or to put more of our capital on the line, ***increasing*** the amount of cash we can lose in the market.

(Message ID **RIN 3038-AC61)**

From: MICHAEL MCGEE <mikecm60@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 12:43 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Mr. Secretary,

I'm writing in response to the pending proposed changes in leverage regarding forex retail trading. I've been a small

trader for a number of years in stocks, bonds, forex, etc. The effective leverage that i now utilize has been a boon

for my trading experiences. I really would hate to see these leverages disappear after having grown accustomed to

them over the years. I, also enjoy the freedom and the flexibility to choose how much or how little leverage i want

to utilize. Mr. Secretary, my hope is that the pending proposed changes for reducing the amount of leverage for the

Forex retail market will not be passed. Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Michael

C. McGee

From: Robert Budnick <Robert@TradewinsGroup.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 12:49 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

RE: RIN 3038-AC61

I'm an investor in foreign currency through a U.S. dealer. I am very concerned about the proposed rules from the CFTC. The CFTC's recent rule proposal, which would limit customer trading leverage to 10 to 1, would be a crippling blow to the U.S. forex industry.

Please register my opposition to the CFTC proposal of a 1:10 leverage for retail Forex trading.

The Forex market's First Rule of Risk is that a trader should never trade with any more capital investment than he/she can afford to lose.

The CFTC proposed leverage revision from 1:100 to 1:10 would increase the amount of my capital investment by 10 times, a 1000% increase in risk exposure.

The basis for my opposition to the proposal is that it flagrantly disregards the Forex market's First Rule of Risk.

This unsustainable rule would drive U.S. forex dealers, which brings tens of millions of dollars into the U.S. banking industry each day, offshore into the hands of foreign competitors. It would encourage fraud both at home and abroad as customers seeking to trade retail forex would have no other legitimate domestic alternative. As an investor, I would be forced to take my business outside of the United States.

Thank you

Robert Budnick

Robert Budnick
Hacienda Heights CA, 91745
Robert@TradewinsGroup.com

From: Bill Kelley <bkelley762@clearwire.net>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 1:07 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Sirs:
Please DO NOT require a 10:1 leverage requirement on US retail Forex brokers. In a free country consenting adults should have the freedom to make their OWN choices as to risk, after consideration of the risk/reward involved in any transaction.

I would prefer to keep my account with a CFTC controlled broker, but several offshore providers come to mind as alternatives if I am forced to seek the products I desire elsewhere.

William Kelley
5780 Lupin Dr.
Sun Valley NV

From: scott.guy@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 2:15 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Do Not Adopt the 10 to 1 Margin Rule for Forex Retail Customers

---

Dear Sirs,
Please do not adopt the 10-to-1 margin rule for Forex retail customers.
If you are truly considering this change as an attempt to shield the consumer from risk, you will accomplish that only in as much as you will drive consumers out of the market, thereby not risking their money. As an devoted trader of Forex for the past 10 years, I can tell you that I am well aware of the risks involved. Likewise, I think anyone trading for 2 days will well understand the risks. The 10-to-1 margin rule will only make it more difficult for me, and others to participate in the market.

The basic end-result of this rule change will be to move this market closer to where it was 20 years ago, where only the wealthy can participate and further hinder those who are trying to accumulate wealth. There is the misconception out there that those with money are more knowledgeable and better suited to participate in the markets, this belief has been viciously destroyed by recent events, look at Madoff and his wealthy "knowledgeable" clients, Allen Stanford, the leaders of Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs, and the other wealthy "knowledgeable" business-persons. They have proven that the wealthy are not role models for identifying, understanding, and dealing with risk.

There are plenty of regulations governing this, and other market. Governing agencies should work to enforce the existing regulations rather than creating additional regulations that only limit activity in the market. Enforcing the existing regulations will help reduce the risk to the small investor by catching the wealthy "knowledgeable" person that attempts to manipulate the market and cheat the other participants.

Sincerely,
Scott Guy
Minneapolis, Minnesota.

From: Kent Loveridge <harvey@burgoyne.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 2:31 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

I am absolutely opposed to the the forex rule changes that you people are imposing on the retail trader. I have already moved some of my trading offshore if these rules go through I will be forced to shut down the rest of my USA based trading and in the long run it will be USA based brokers that are being hurt. Its a sad when US citizens have to move there accounts to former communist countries because they
have learned communism does not work and it will not work here . I will do all in my power to get rid of the current government people who are imposing communism on the United States.

Kent

From: Robert Ryder <rjryde@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 3:04 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Dear Sirs,

Limiting current limits of 100:1 to 10:1 would prevent me from making a living. I would be forced to take my money out of the United States. I believe many others would do the same. Please do not pass this. RIN 3038-AC61.

Thank you,

Bob Ryder

From: Nigel Keningston <nigelkeningston@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 3:30 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

As a small time investor i like the higher leverage of 100-1 or higher
I can risk small amounts for potential higher value/pip return
As a small investor the current high leverage gives me opportunities in the FX market i otherwise wouldn't be able to achieve
10 - 1 levg.becomes completely unappealing at my level of investment. Infact it kinda puts me out off the race

--
Cheers Nigel
NZ New Cars

Check out
www.nznew.co.nz

Ph: 0274477038
04 9042262
or steve
0212681323
Headoffice 0800 696392

From: steve kunkler <kunklersteve@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 6:13 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Thank you for opening the proposed retail forex regulatory scheme to public comment. However, as an individual, I do not have the resources to specifically comment on all the proposals included in this 50 page document. I suspect I am not alone in this. My concern therefore is that the bulk of comments will be generated by the large stakeholders with massive resources; the defense lawyers, lobbyists, the forex dealers and banks. Even so, I would like to make the following comments focusing on the essential elements of retail forex that allow retail forex dealers(RFD) to flourish. These elements are the heart of this machine and make it possible for the principals of these operations to accumulate mind boggling wealth at the expense of inexperienced individuals (victims) The vast majority of these do not have the financial resources nor the training or experience to speculate/gamble in this. Tn he RFD do not as they claim "serve the needs of forex traders seeking access to the currency markets". RFD fund the enterprise that creates the inexperienced victims who have no clue as to the real nature of this scam. The victims only seek out the RFD after they have been lured by and then herded to them by fraudulent scammers who will benefit by their loss. The vast majority of these victims lose their deposits and don't know they have been robbed and if they do figure it out they lack the resources to gain access to the remedy.If the sum total of the regulatory scheme do not address these elements, the resource deep stakeholders will surely find a way around them and continue to flourish.

1) The RFD can pay referring parties whatever, whenever and wherever he wants. These amounts can be hundreds of thousands per month and often exceed millions annually. These monies provide the fuel for this enterprise. As the referring party (RP) knowingly subjects the victims funds to churning, effectively washing the funds, the RFD, the RP and many times a fund manager get rich.

2) 99% of the time the RFD acts as an adversarial counterparty. As soon as the RFD can he self insures againts any uncontrollable losses which are few. The victims are not trading in the large, liquid foreign exchange market but rather with one young man with no background in the financial industry. He cut his teeth on the pac man video game. He is trained to drain victims accounts and has all the video game like programmed rules in his favor. His behavior is rewarded if he drains accounts while the risk of his placing the RFD at risk for price manipulation is nearly non-existent. **He does not need to go to any price! Every bank in the Interbank market can go to a price and doesn't want to nor is there any regulatory force that compels him to do so.** He can invalidate a trade that goes against him and call the price he quoted a mistake (a bad handle). He can give different prices to different victims who have taken the exact positions at exactly the same time, he can cancel or close out a position at any time at his discretion, he can delay quoting prices, he can widen his spread in either direction, in the event of Internet connectivity or software glitch issues the dealer wins,the list goes on and on.

3)There are 3 federal agents working for OSHA in the small area of Traverse City, MI who can stop by any worksite or business unnanounced to enforce OSHA rules and impose thousands of dollars in fines. RFD should be subject to the same scrutiny and enforcement. The fines could more than pay for this activity. The agents should be able to interview anyone working there without their boss present. Everyone working at a RFD should be required to learn material and be tested so that they have the basic knowledge to undestand the regulations and spot fraud. Everyone should be registered. They should be trained to and required to report suspicious activities directly to the CFTC and be provided quick and robust protections under Whistle Blower laws. If employees do not report suspicions they should be prosecuted. Regulators should be able to assemble these employees and remind them of these duties. Price manipulation, accounting, and IT manipulation will only be detected this way.

4) If violations are found the fd should be quickly required to demonstrate to the regulator that this is not a violation. If violations are confirmed the public must be advised of this promptly and be directed to this information. The current process of CFTC reparations/nfa enforcement are not transparent enough. The fd should be required to display all past violations, fines or other enforcement actions against any registrant, ever. A registrant who has a history of violations in the Securities/Futures area should display this. A complete criminal background check should be displayed on the FD website for every person working there.

5) 100 to 1 leverage must be stopped. The CFTC and FINRA must adopt the same 4 to 1 limits. The FD association has publicly stated that this would put an end to retail forex trading. Fantastic. The legitimate foreign exchange market exists to serve the needs of sovereign government, banks, and business to allow world trade. The retail forex industry was created by wise guys who couldn'cut it in the legitimate fiancial industry or were prohibited from doing so. There is no legitimate business purpose for this pretend activty. The FD association spews the jobs angle. I think the world does not need or want these kind of jobs. Tax receipts are another angle. There is one thing that I am 100% sure of. Anyone running a reatil forex scam resents government, feels that tax laws don't apply to them, and will do anything to avoid regulation and pay taxes.

6) RFD should be required to clearly inform that its charts are either bid or ask charts. They should be required to clearly display current and historic price spreads to show victims how they widen and shrink spreads instantaneously to avoid limits and go after (gun) for stops. The dealers software at the RFD I know would actually make a loud gunshot sound when a victim would loose money! RFD currently remove " bad handle" prices from history that seriously alter technical indicators. A victim can see an indicator crossover, enter a position, and then look at an historic chart and the crossover is not there. (I'm not sure why a RFD could not remove any price, bad handle or not, causing indicator confusion and removing unwanted records) A RFD should be required to show in table form and charts all current and historic prices offered and bid and prices at which positions were closed at.
7) A victim should see on his trading screen the fact and amount that any Reffering Party or Fund Manager is making on each trade that he/she makes. Many of these payments are made to referring parties whether the victim wins or looses on a trade. Many fund managers charge management fees that are charged regardless if the victim makes or looses money. In RF tading it is uncommon that any managed accounts ultimatley make money. Any trades that show profit are soon negated by many more loosing trades or commisions. If a referring party is earning a portion of the spreads this should be displayed. On a RFD documents they state that a victim (trader) has the right to be informed of this fact, but make no reference as to how or if they actually do this.

8)The RFD forces he vast majority of customer service or trading desk correspondence to be done by phone to avoid email/written trails. This also places a victim in a vulnerable position if they can not understand the RFD fast talk or record the response from the RFD. International victims are also taken advantage of considering the cost and reliability of phone correspondence.The RFD should be requred to respond to email commuication in written form. Challenges to trade activity should be recorded both audibly, then transcribed and responses made audibly and then precisley transcribed and sent to the victim in written form.

9) Prospective victims should be advised that the remedies for any fraud or price manipulation they detect are very expensive, take years to conclude, heavily favor the RFD with nearly limitless legal resouces and are therefore simply not available to the available victim.

10) If the RFD changes any of its trading rules all current and future victims should be notified of this in

writing and these notices should be made at least 24 hours in advance of the change. This notice and the change should appear on the trading screens for at least a week and a chronilogical archive of these should be displayed on the RFD website. I know a RFD who changed his stop order rules four times in less than a year without notice.

11) Prospective victims should be informed that the registration of the RFD, its status as an FCM or FDM, nor its published Net Trading Requirement in no way implies that this dealer can be trusted. This speaks more to the fact that this dealer has made a lot of money at the expense of previous victims. A wealthy dealer will honor requests to withdraw funds only because these are written documents and if they did not honor these if would be a huge red flag unlike price manipulation/churning/fraud which are very hard to prove and goes on under the radar of regulators.

12) Free trading accounts, risk free trial or practice accounts are fundamentally different than actual trading activity for a number of reasons.

a) No dealer involvement or discretion. The dealers adversarial nature and all his tools to drain accounts are not present.

b)Trial trading is done under different trading rules with smoother pricesand consistent narrow spreads. Fills are generated automatically by mathematical formulas designed to favor prospective victim results.

c) With play money the fear of loosing does not exist. The RFD targets victims with little experience who are lured to the dealer by someone who will benefit from their losses; forex "education" providers, software marketers, fraudulent fund managers. Inexperienced victims become very fearful and under this stress, react and make terrible decisions. The RFD knows this and exploits this advantage. They train their young dealers to drain accounts and give them all the tools and rules to do just this. These dealers sit at a computer like they would play a video game for 8 hours a day 5 days a week and can have years of experience. The RFD loves it and can manipulate internet connectivity, server up time or software gliches. The inexperienced trader will freak out when this happens and most often try to call the dealing desk to close out positions for a loss.

13) A RFD should be required to produce a snapshot list of all funded accounts with complete contact information. Any accounts that have common control should be grouped with complete contact information on the person/entity which has the ability to trade or deposit or access funds from these ze accounts. These contacts must be valid and known by the dealers. Regulators should be able to freeze accounts until the controlling or ownership parties can be contacted to confirm the accuracy and legitamacy of the account and its location. This snapshot should include the amount of funds available for the account owners to withdraw. The total of this is the total liability the RFD should be able to offset assets (profits/capital gains) and reflect this on his reports to the CFTC, financial statements and tax returns. Funds above this level are the RFD net trading capital/ gross profit. Many RFD try to hide profits by claiming that much of the funds have not yet been lost to the RFD or they create fake accounts or accounts controlled by entities or individuals on the take from which they can inflate their losses or their liability. 95% of all RF trading account funds are drained by the RFD. The amount of liability they should be able to claim on the current level of deposits should reflect this reality.
616-481-7774

From: steve kunkler <kunklersteve@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 6:21 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Previous email sent as comments to proposed retail forex regulations

---

Please disregard and delete the email I just sent you with my comments about the proposed retail forex regulations.
I was working on my comments and accidentally emailed them to you. They have not been edited and may not be complete.

One question. If I submit my final comments anonymously will they be accepted?

Thank you,

Steve Kunkler.
616-481-7774

From: Dr. SS <b4zip@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 8:38 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Regulation of Retail Forex

Hello CFTC

please do not mess with Leverage in Forex, keep it at 100:1
each investor should be able to choose their own level of Risk

your idea is a bad one, really bad!

----- Forwarded Message ----
From: FX Solutions <email@e.fxsolutions.com>
To: b4zip@yahoo.com
Sent: Fri, January 22, 2010 1:24:28 PM
Subject: How the Proposed CFTC Regulations Will Impact You

This message contains graphics. If you do not see the graphics, click here to view.

HOME | ACCOUNTS | TRADING | LEARNING & TOOLS | THE COMPANY | INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES | SUPPORT

Dear FX Solutions Customer,

Recently, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) announced that it is seeking public comment on proposed regulations concerning Forex trading. In part, the proposed regulations states:

> *to collect security deposits in a minimum amount in order to prudentially limit the leverage available to their retail customers on such transactions at 10 to 1*

This means that leverage limits will be reduced from current limits of 100:1 to 10:1 for all Forex trading in the U.S. Below is an example of how the proposed leverage reduction would affect your Forex trading account.

FX Solutions is a proud registrant of the CFTC and member of the NFA and we will continue to cooperate with the CFTC and NFA in their efforts to eliminate fraud and deception within the Forex Market. However, we believe that you should be given the freedom to choose the appropriate amount of leverage for your individual trading style and risk tolerance.

If you feel strongly about the proposal, we urge you to submit your comments directly to the CFTC. In order to ensure that your voice is heard, please send your comments to the CFTC by **March 22, 2010** and be sure to include **Regulation of Retail Forex** in the subject line and identification number **RIN 3038-AC61** in the body of your message.

You can contact the CFTC through any of the following methods:

Email: secretary@cftc.gov
Fax: (202) 418-5521
Mail: David Stawick,
Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission,

1155 21st Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20581
Web: Federal eRulemaking Portal

FX Solutions is currently reviewing these proposed rules and along with the U.S. Forex Dealer Coalition will publish our opinion in the coming days. For more details on the proposed regulation visit the CFTC.

FX Solutions is a global Forex company which is committed to providing our clients with the utmost in transparency and client service. Our clients have the option to open accounts in either the UK or Australia which offer flexible leverage and are not impacted by CFTC rules. For information about FX Solutions regulated outside the United States, please visit Trading with Higher Leverage or contact Customer Service.

Sincerely,
FX Solutions

From: Stephen B. Lord <lord.sb@stephen-lord.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 9:19 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: Opposed to 10:1 Leverage Limit

Dear Secretary,

I must tell you that I am opposed to the CFTC's 10:1 leverage limit because it places restrictive limits for traders that can not afford to come up with large sums of capital to trade.

I take care of my moms & dads bills and have very little cash left to trade with and because of that, I'm locked out of equites, options and most other instruments. But with FX, it's great to be able to open an account with $500 or less. That allows small traders like myself to take advantage of the financial markets.

Best regards,

Stephen Lord

From: Eric Parker <fz3501oq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 9:26 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject:

Dear NFA and Department Heads,

You are going to go out of business and destroy the US Forex trading industry in the process. Foreign brokers are not going to put up with your Nazi-Communist style control in how foreign brokers deal with currency trading with US citizens in foreign countries brokers. The US government needs tax revenue here in the US, but if you and the CFTC continue your goal of □world domination□ of the forex market, you are going to cause a huge flee of money from the US into other countries. This is the most unpatriotic thing that the NFA and the CFTC could ever do.

You must be aware that large and small brokers and traders throughout the world and in the US are ABSOLUTELY PISSED OFF AT YOU!!!! Including myself. From my research, the NFA plans to try and regulate US citizens□ ability to trade freely without your restrictions in other countries starting in April 2010. I strongly advise you to stop what you are doing and think about the consequences of trying to □rule the world□. The US will loose broker jobs and income, the US government will loose tax revenue, and most of all a lot of people are planning to leave this country, give up citizenship and never come back. This includes my self. When this happens, the NFA will go out of business because there will be no currency traders or brokers in the US to control. So much for job security.

Will you not control me, my family, nor my future. The NFA is nothing but a communist bigot idiot. Your ONLY role for the US should ONLY be to have a purpose for what you are doing□..not just to restrict the ability of Americans to make money in Forex. If your concern is to □protect the citizen□, then provide Education through brokers so people can learn how to safely earn money in the forex market. But the rate you are going, you will put everyone out of business including the NFA, and this is exactly what Obama is trying to prevent. Shame on you NFA for being so Anti-American. You belong in communist Russia and Communist China, not the in land of the brave and the free.

Please reconsider your actions and become more constructive, please□□□.

Sincerely,

Eric Parker

From: Eric Parker <fz3501oq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 9:29 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: RE: RIN 3038- AC61

To: David Stawick
From: Arlene Parker
Re: RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Mr. David Stawick,

re: RIN 3038-AC61

I strongly disagree with the above proposed legislation. This would cause a loss of jobs and tax revenue for the US government. People would move their trading out of the US which is not in the best interests of the American people or government.

I and every individual in this country have the right to trade and manage money in the manner they see fit within the law. But the government has no right to control my ability to make profit.

Please help us help you by voting no on this legislation and get this message to Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Arlene Parker

From: Eric Parker <fz3501oq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 9:33 PM
To: secretary <secretary@CFTC.gov>
Subject: RE: RIN 3038-AC61

To: David Stawick
From: Eric Parker
Re: RIN 3038-AC61

Dear Mr. David Stawick,

RE: RIN 3038-AC61

I strongly disagree with the above proposed legislation. This would cause a loss of jobs and tax revenue for the US government. People would move their trading out of the US which is not in the best interests of the American people or government.

I and every individual in this country have the right to trade and manage money in the manner they see fit within the law. But the government has no right to control my ability to make profit.

Please help us help you by voting no on this legislation and get this message to Congress.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric Parker